



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,954	04/03/2001	Jose Luis Montero Real	60001.0042US01	1571
27488	7590	03/24/2005	EXAMINER	
MICROSOFT CORPORATION C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C. P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			CHANG, ERIC	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2116	

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

JK

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/824,954

Applicant(s)

REAL, JOSE LUIS MONTERO

Examiner

Eric Chang

Art Unit

2116

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10,13-20,26 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10,13-20,26 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-10, 13-20, 26 and 27 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 1-6 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,396,515 to Hetherington et al., in view of U.S. Patent 6,340,937 B1 to Stepita-Klauco.
4. As to claim 1, Hetherington discloses a method for booting an application program running over an operating system on a computer, wherein the application program and operating system support a plurality of editing languages, the method comprising the steps of: booting the application program [col. 2, lines 42-45]; and setting a plurality of default language settings of the application program to be equal to a user interface language of the operating system [col. 2, lines 42-51]. Hetherington teaches basing the default language settings of the application program based on a language property for the host data processing system [FIG. 2B, element 214].

Hetherington teaches all of the limitations of the claim, including setting the language when the application program is executed, but does not specifically teach determining if it is the first boot of the application module in order to set the language.

Stepita-Klauco teaches a multilingual computer system that allows users to use different languages for their software [col. 1, lines 14-24]. Thus, Stepita-Klauco teaches a computer system that supports different languages, similar to that of Hetherington. Stepita-Klauco further teaches that the active language may be set to a default language [col. 6, lines 24-34].

Specifically, Stepita-Klauco teaches that the active language may be set to a default language, or a selected language, at installation or configuration time, or any other suitable time or arbitrary manner [col. 6, lines 34-44]. Indeed, Stepita-Klauco teaches that the language may be set by any number of other selection parameters; thus, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that this would comprise the initial or subsequent boots of said application program.

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ the configuration at the initial loading of the application program as taught by Stepita-Klauco. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so that the software would be configured correctly for subsequent loadings of the application program.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of the cited references because they are both directed to the problem of configuring the user-interface language of an application program. Moreover, the configuration during the initial loading means taught by Stepita-Klauco would improve the flexibility of Hetherington because it allowed the user to set the language settings according to any desired default language selection method [col. 6, lines 34-44], such as using an operating system language setting for an initial boot or a previously set default language for subsequent boots of the application program.

Art Unit: 2116

5. As to claims 2-6, Hetherington discloses the plurality of default language settings comprise an install language of the application program, a Web locale language of the application program, a help language of the application program and a user interface language of the application program [col. 3, lines 59-67, and col. 4, lines 1-8]. Hetherington teaches the language settings are applied to all user interface text and user-interface components, such as install dialog box language, help text, and the like.

6. As to claim 26, Stepita-Klauco teaches that the default language settings are set in response to any number of selection parameters [col. 6, lines 37-44], such as a registry key, substantially as claimed.

7. Claims 7-10, 13-20 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,396,515 to Hetherington et al., in view of U.S. Patent 6,340,937 B1 to Stepita-Klauco, and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,014,616 to Kim.

8. As to claims 7-10, Hetherington and Stepita-Klauco teach all of the limitations of the claim, including that the language may be selected based on a physical keyboard [Stepita-Klauco, col. 6, lines 37-41], but do not teach enabling an editing language for the application program based on an IME.

Kim teaches that the editing language for an application program may be set by an input locale, such as a keyboard, light pen, or the like [col. 4, lines 25-34], and determining an applied language while the application is running, and enabling the determined language therefrom [col.

Art Unit: 2116

4, lines 47-52]. Kim also teaches that this setting occurs based on an IME, or the like [col. 1, lines 38-47]. It would further be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that other detection of an enabled language, such as an operating system or script setting could also be used to set the editing language of the application [col. 4, lines 1-3], substantially as claimed.

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ the editing language enabling means as taught by Kim. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so that the editing language for the application could be automatically set, in addition to the user interface language.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of the cited references because they are both directed to the problem of selecting the user language of an application from a plurality of available languages. Moreover, the editing language enabling means taught by Kim would improve the flexibility of Hetherington and Stepita-Klauco because it allowed for a visual representation of the active editing language, in addition to the dynamic selection of said language based on an input locale.

9. As to claim 13, Hetherington and Stepita-Klauco teach a method for booting an application program running over an operating system on a computer, wherein the application program and operating system support a plurality of editing languages, the method comprising the steps of: booting the application program [col. 2, lines 42-45]; and setting a plurality of default language settings of the application program to be equal to a user interface language of the operating system [col. 2, lines 42-51]. Kim teaches enabling at least one editing language for

Art Unit: 2116

a plurality of keyboards, IMEs and AIMEs, input locales, or operating system settings installed on the computer [col. 4, lines 1-3, 25-34 and 47-52], substantially as claimed.

10. As to claims 14-15, Kim discloses the input locale comprises software that allows text to be input [col. 1, lines 38-47], and that the input locale adjusts the properties of a keyboard, such as the layout, accordingly.

11. As to claim 16, Hetherington discloses the operating system script comprises a set of files that enable support in the operating system for that language [col. 3, lines 59-67].

12. As to claim 17, Kim discloses determining whether a language has been applied within the application program and, if so, then enabling an editing language associated with the applied language [col. 1, lines 38-47]. Kim teaches enabling the appropriate editing language for an application program based on the applied language settings.

13. As to claim 18, Kim discloses the step of determining whether a language has been applied within the application program comprises determining whether a language associated with an insertion point within the application program is a language that has not been enabled [col. 4, lines 47-52]. Kim teaches determining the language for the application program when the user changes the language settings at an insertion point by selecting a new language from the keyboard.

Art Unit: 2116

14. As to claim 19, Heatherington, Stepita-Klauco and Kim teach all of the limitations of the claim. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adjust the value of a plurality of registry keys associated with the plurality of editing languages, because many operating system settings, such as enabled languages, are stored within the registry, substantially as claimed.

15. As to claim 20, Hetherington, Stepita-Klauco and Kim teach the method for setting the language settings for an application program, substantially as claimed. Because Hetherington, Stepita-Klauco and Kim teach the method, they teach a computer-readable medium comprising computer-readable instructions for performing the method.

16. As to claim 27, Stepita-Klauco teaches that the default language settings are set in response to any number of selection parameters [col. 6, lines 37-44], such as a registry key, substantially as claimed.

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10, 13-20, 26 and 27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2116

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric Chang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3671. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne Browne can be reached on (571) 272-3670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2116

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

March 15, 2005
ec


LYNNE H. BROWNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100